

Application No. 10/680,690
November 16, 2005
Page 9 of 12

Docket No. CS23737RL - Kuchibhotla

REMARKS

The issues currently in the instant application are as follows:

- Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2), as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.
- Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0040313) in view of Park (U.S. Pat. No 6,741,868).
- Claims 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Park (U.S. Pat. No 6,741,868).

Applicant traverses all the outstanding rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal thereof in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate claim 2. Claim 2 has been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 3 and 6 have been amended to remove parenthetical phrases. No new matter has been added.

Claims 3-16 and 23 have been amended to harmonize terminology with amended claim 1. Namely, "core network" has been replaced with "public land mobile network." This is supported by original claim 2 and page 6 lines 1-4 of the originally-filed specification. No new matter has been added.

Claim 24 has been added dependent from claim 6 and includes the subject matter of a parenthetical phrase that was removed in amended claim 6. This amended is supported by original claim 6. No new matter has been added.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment was made for the purpose of narrowing

Application No. 10/680,690
November 16, 2005
Page 10 of 12

Docket No. CS23737RL - Kuchibhotla

the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

35 U.S.C. § 112(2)

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, namely, the parentheses are considered indefinite.

Applicant has removed the parenthetical phrases from claim 3 and has also removed similar parenthetical phrases from claim 6. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2).

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Claims 1-9 – Hogan and Park

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0040313) in view of Park (U.S. Pat. No 6,741,868). Hogan suggests a mechanism for a user equipment (UE) to select only location areas (LAs) that are not on a “forbidden LA” list sent from a cellular system. Park contemplates a hybrid type terminal, capable of using either a synchronous or an asynchronous communication protocol, selecting from an asynchronous and a synchronous core network.

Hogan does not receive at least one public land mobile network identifier (PLMNid) or select a PLMNid as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate claim 2 and thus specify that at least one PLMNid is received and not an MSC node identifier and/or a GPRS node identifier. Note that the MSC node 18 and the GPRS node 20 in FIG. 6 of Hogan both belong to the same core network service nodes 16, which would have a single PLMNid. Thus, FIG. 6 of Hogan does not have two different core networks as stated by the Examiner.

Even though Hogan contemplates a shared network situation (see FIG. 3 and paragraphs [0032] – [0033] of Hogan), Hogan never even remotely suggests selecting a

Application No. 10/680,690
November 16, 2005
Page 11 of 12

Docket No. CS23737RL - Kuchibhotla

PLMNid to form a selected public land mobile network identifier as recited in amended claim 1. Hogan also does not set an indicator to indicate whether a substitute PLMN is allowed as recited in amended claim 1. Park also does not set an indicator to indicate whether a substitute PLMN is allowed as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, amended claim 1 is not unpatentable over Hogan and Park. Claim 2 has been canceled. Amended claims 3-9 depend directly or indirectly upon amended claim 1 and thus are also not unpatentable over Hogan and Park. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Hogan and Park is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Claims 10-16 – Hogan and Park

Claims 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0040313) in view of Park (U.S. Pat. No 6,741,868). As alluded to previously with respect to amended claim 1, neither Hogan nor Park show or suggest an indicator indicating whether a substitute PLMN is allowed as recited in amended claim 10. Thus amended claim 10 is not unpatentable in view of Hogan and Park. Amended claims 11-16 depend directly or indirectly upon amended claim 11 and thus are also not unpatentable over Hogan and Park. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Hogan and Park is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) – Claims 17-23 – Park

Claims 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Park (U.S. Pat. No 6,741,868). As stated previously with reference to claim 1, Park does not show or suggest setting an indicator to indicate whether a substitute PLMN is allowed as recited in independent claims 17 and 23. The outstanding Office Action states that Park shows such a step; however, Applicant is unable to find anywhere in Park that supports the Examiner's statement – including any reference in the Abstract of Park or

Application No. 10/680,690
November 16, 2005
Page 12 of 12

Docket No. CS23737RL - Kuchibhotla

in column 18 lines 5-40 of Park. Thus, Applicant believes independent claims 17 and 23 are not anticipated by Park. Claims 18-22 depend directly or indirectly upon amended claim 17 and thus are also not anticipated by Park. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Park is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

The application is in condition for allowance and a favorable response at an early date is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **Deposit Account 502117.**

Respectfully submitted,

Please send correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept. (SYC)
600 North U.S. Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048
Customer Number: 20280

By: Sylvia Chen 16 Nov 2005
Sylvia Chen Date
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,633
Tel. No. (847) 523-1096
Fax No. (847) 523-2350
Email: Sylvia.Chen@motorola.com